

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 16:19:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, I'm not exactly sure what the hell you just tried to get across there but I'll cope.

Article 51 says:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Nothing in that statement says anything about being legally allowed to pre-empting an attack. It says you may act after the matter of fact, but not before. Sounds pretty stupid, don't you think? I would agree with you on that one. The Russian president saying that someone will attack doesn't validate this article, legally. Irregardless of United States law, if this Article isn't upheld, then the act is illegal in accordance with the international laws that your country agreed to.

I bet you, and a lot of individuals probably feel pretty stupid reading that after you get a warning from Putin. Oh, and before you go off on another of your little tirades, set aside your annoying off topic "morality" and look at this from strictly a legal aspect. That is, of course, if you've learned that laws aren't guidelines that only need to be upheld if you feel them just.

---